

SGCC Privacy Subgroup meeting February 22, 2013

Attendees:

Rebecca Herold – Privacy Professor
Tanya Brewer – NIST
Ken Wacks – GWAC, H2G DEWG
Irene Gassko – FPL
Paul Zummo – APPA
Kristina Schaeffer --- Ohio PUC
Megan Hertzler – Xcel Energy
Dan Francis – AEP
Aryeh Fishman – EEI
Tony Munoz – Colorado PUC
Mary Ann Ralls – NRECA
Tim Schoecler – Univ of Colorado
Marianne Swanson – NIST

Meetings Going Forward

We will have a break from meetings before going to SGIP 2.0. We will use these last meetings to consider ideas for topics going forward for the group. We will meet today and next Friday, March 1st.

As information becomes available about getting onto the new mailing lists, Tanya will pass it to the group for those joining SGIP 2.0.

One of the other things we will be doing will be looking at is constructing a roadmap of who is doing what in the realm of privacy in the Smart Grid.

Going Over the Topic Ideas

1. Outreach needs – submitted by Amanda Stallings, OPUC
The real goal here is to help reach consumers that have no or bad information about smart meters, etc. The Smart Grid Consumer's group does some work in this. EEI has papers on RF admissions and other topics, have a rapid response team that will respond to requests by utilities, a website, a toolkit, and media relations materials for utilities. These are designed for utilities, not consumers, and are available to EEI members only. EPRI may have some materials on these topics. There is a study from Texas on some of these issues. [DOE Smart Grid Customer Engagement Working Group](#) deals with how you educate and communicate with consumers. Some are looking to consumer groups or non-regulated utilities to provide information to the consumers. Perhaps this group could provide some sort of pointers list. Xcel Energy also has materials on their website that talk about the two types of meters and various consumer concerns.
2. Multiple topics from Erik O'Connor and Rick Potter, Alliant Energy; particularly in dealing with new apps. Discussion postponed until next week to see if Erik or Rick can make the discussion.
3. Aggregation of data needs – Heather McNay. Similar to the topic by Megan Hertzler, Xcel Energy.
In Colorado there is the set standard of 15/15 for aggregation, but there is no set standard for most of the other states. There seems to be no industry consensus on this. Some say the 15/15 rule is too restrictive. What is the correct formula for protecting

privacy while still having the data be useful. Does this overlap with the SEE Action group's work? Their work talks about a couple different approaches, but doesn't really solve the question at hand. Are the companies wanting a single consumer's data, and over what time frame? They want consumption data by rate class, which can be some very small numbers of customers in an area. Then there are those asking for how many within a rate class participate within some sort of program. Again, this makes for some very small data sets, which increases privacy risks. Part of the challenge also is that the requesters are not private industry; they may be counties or municipalities. There is a desire to help these organizations with meeting their goals, but to do so while protecting consumers' privacy. This (developing a set of generally accepted privacy principles specific to creating aggregated sets of data) could be a good topic for our group going forward. This could also help those making requests to scope their requests in ways that would still be useful to them while protecting privacy sufficiently.

4. Multiple topics from APPA, NRECA, and EEI
CEUD data being used by cloud services – Would like to stick to the technical aspects of how to protect data. How do you secure the data; how do you secure cloud storage? Is this a privacy issue? This seems to be data protection. How do you establish standards around technology and software that could be used to implement privacy? When dealing with privacy, you have the administrative issues, the technical issues, and the physical aspects. You can't really pull out the administrative issues and still be covering all of privacy. If the administrative leg would include policies, then that is an open issue. The cryptography work that was happening in the CSWG has been ported over to DOE's NESCOR group. There is currently no cryptography work going on in the larger SGIP group. Use cases might be a useful tool for the engineers and others creating the systems that could help protect privacy. Our developed use cases will be in the next version of NISTIR 7628.

If anyone has any additional suggestions for work to take forward, please get them in within the next few days to Rebecca and Tanya for consideration next week.

Work being done by others:

1. [Voluntary Code of Conduct – Department of Energy](#)
The public portion of this work will be beginning with a meeting next Tuesday, February 26th. The scope of this group will be taken into consideration as the group goes forward. The challenge will be to see how this can add to what has already been done by NAESB and this group.
2. DOE's Smart Grid Customer Engagement Working Group
3. The [DOE Energy Advisory Committee](#) – coming out with a whitepaper soon.

We will cover the Home-to-Grid DEWG's information first thing next week.

If anyone has any additional information about smart grid privacy work being done by other groups, please get them in within the next few days to Rebecca and Tanya for consideration next week.

Next call: Friday, March 1st; 11am Eastern
Call-in 866-793-6322; 3836162#